



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/134,451	08/14/98	GRAFF	R GRAFF-F1-98

LM71/1119

**EXAMINER**

ROSEN, N

**ART UNIT**

**PAPER NUMBER**

2764

5

**DATE MAILED:** 11/19/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/134,451	Applicant(s) Graff
Examiner Nicholas D. Rosen	Group Art Unit 2764
	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas D. Rosen (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Peter Trzyna (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Nov 12, 1999

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Trzyna called, again asking why a Terminal Disclaimer was required when a patent issued on the instant application would in any case not last longer than the patent for which the TD was required. Examiner Rosen attempted to answer (so that claims obvious over each other must remain commonly assigned, for example), but, not being expert on the issue, offered to have a Special Programs Examiner call Mr. Trzyna. Mr. Trzyna agreed, and Examiner Rosen took the case to SPRE Vincent Trans. [On 11/16/99, SPRE Trans informed Examiner Rosen that he, Trans, had discussed the case with Mr. Trzyna on 11/12/99.]

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

*Nicholas D. Rosen*  
Nov 13, 1999

James L. Trzyna  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Received by Mail  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Washington, D.C. 20591-0000